

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF ERIE

DENNIS COLLINS

Index No.

Plaintiff(s),

*Summons**-against-*THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF BUFFALO AND
BISHOP RICHARD J. MALONE

Date Index No. Purchased:

Defendant(s).

To the above named Defendant(s)

Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, 795 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14203
Bishop Richard J. Malone, 795 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14203

You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action and to serve a copy of your answer, or, if the complaint is not served with this summons, to serve a notice of appearance, on the Plaintiff's attorney within 20 days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service (or within 30 days after the service is complete if this summons is not personally delivered to you within the State of New York); and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you by default for the relief demanded in the complaint.

The basis of venue is Defendants' principal place of business,
which is in Erie County

Dated: August 14, 2019

Seeger Weiss LLP

by 

Stephen A. Weiss

Attorneys for Plaintiff

77 Water Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Phone: (212) 584-0700
Fax: (212) 584-0799

Stephen A. Weiss (NY ID# 2413342)
Christopher A. Seeger (NY ID# 2425304)
Rick Barreca (NY ID# 2972735)
SEEGER WEISS LLP
77 Water Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Phone: 212-584-0700
Fax: 212-584-0799
sweiss@seegerweiss.com
cseeger@seegerweiss.com
rbarreca@seegerweiss.com

Gerald J. Williams (NY ID #5620695)
Shauna L. Friedman (NY ID#5609755)
WILLIAMS CEDAR, LLC
1515 Market Street, Suite 1300
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102-1931
Phone: 215.557.0099
Fax: 215.557.0673
gwilliams@williamscedar.com
sfriedman@williamscedar.com

Application to New York Bar Pending:

Michelle Simpson Tuegel
SEEGER WEISS LLP
77 Water Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Phone: 212-584-0700
Fax: 212-584-0799
MSimpson-Tuegel@seegerweiss.com

Muhammad S. Aziz
ABRAHAM, WATKINS, NICHOLS,
SORRELS, AGOSTO & AZIZ
800 Commerce Street
Houston, Texas 77002-1776
Phone: 713-222-7211
Fax: 713-225-0827
maziz@awtxlaw.com

Pro Hac Vice Application to be Filed:

Beth G. Cole
WILLIAMS CEDAR, LLC
1515 Market Street, Suite 1300
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102-1931
Phone: 215.557.0099
Fax: 215.557.0673
bcole@williamscedar.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF ERIE

DENNIS COLLINS,

Index No. _____

Plaintiff,

-against-

COMPLAINT

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE
OF BUFFALO AND BISHOP RICHARD J. MALONE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendants.

Plaintiff, Dennis Collins, by and through the undersigned attorneys, complains of Defendants, The Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo and Bishop Richard J. Malone, and alleges on personal knowledge as to himself and on information and belief as to all other matters, as follows:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Dennis Collins is a forty-eight year old resident of New York. Plaintiff was in seventh grade at the time of the sexual abuse alleged herein.

2. Defendant Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, New York a/k/a Diocese of Buffalo ("the Diocese") was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New York with its principal place of business at 795 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14203.

3. Defendant Bishop Richard J. Malone (“Malone”) is the current Bishop of the Diocese of Buffalo, which has its principal place of business at 795 Main Street, Buffalo, New York, 14203.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants pursuant to CPLR §§301 and 302, because Plaintiff’s claims arise from the tortious acts of Defendants that were committed in the State of New York.

5. The Court has jurisdiction over this action because the amount of damages Plaintiff seeks exceeds the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts which would otherwise have jurisdiction.

6. Venue is proper in the County of Erie under CPLR §503 because all or a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this cause of action occurred in Erie County, New York.

7. The federal courts lack jurisdiction over this suit. Plaintiff’s claim raises no federal question nor does Plaintiff seek relief under a federal law, statute, regulation, treaty, or the United States Constitution. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s right to relief does not depend on the resolution of a substantial question of federal law. Further, this lawsuit cannot be removed because there is no complete diversity, as at least one Defendant resides or has their principal place of business in New York. Therefore, removal would be improper.

FACTS

8. William G. Stanton (“Stanton”) was ordained a Roman Catholic priest in 1949 and served within the Buffalo Diocese at St. Ambrose Church, 65 Ridgewood Road, Buffalo, New York 14220.

9. Stanton served many parishes and schools during his nearly fifty-five (55) years as a priest.

10. When Plaintiff was in 7th grade at St. Ambrose Church, a nun, Sister Peggy Conlon accused him of having drugs on him and took him to see Stanton.

11. The nun stood outside the door while Plaintiff had to go inside a room to meet alone with Stanton. Stanton ordered Plaintiff to strip down to his underwear and said he was going to search him for drugs.

12. While Plaintiff stood naked in his underwear, Stanton said, “let’s search in there” and reached into his underwear and grabbed his genitals.

13. After the encounter, Stanton told Plaintiff not to tell anyone what had happened.

14. At the time of this abuse, Plaintiff was serving as an altar boy at the Church. However, he immediately quit after the abuse because he was too scared to be around Stanton anymore.

15. After finishing the 8th grade, Plaintiff told his mother that he wanted to go to public school. He withdrew from Catholic School and enrolled in public school the following year.

16. Stanton passed away January 7, 2004.

17. Defendant Malone is the current Bishop of the Diocese of Buffalo and was appointed in 2012 as the 14th Bishop of the Diocese of Buffalo.

18. As bishop, Defendant Malone was and is empowered by the Diocese to supervise and control all priests within the Diocese.

19. As bishop, Defendant Malone had and has access to and knowledge of information regarding the sexual misconduct of priests, including knowledge of the widespread pedophilia and sexually abusive conduct of priests within the Diocese.

20. Defendant Malone has permitted at least one (1) predator priest to return to active ministry after being suspended for credible sexual abuse allegations. He later ignored new allegations of sexual abuse against this priest and misled the public about the priest's history.

21. Defendant Malone has and continues to permit predatory priests in active ministry to work around children despite allegations of sexual abuse against minors.

22. Defendant Malone also intentionally omitted the names of some priests accused of abuse or misconduct from a publicly released list of names.

23. In approximately March 2018, Defendants publicly admitted they knew of 42 priests who worked in the Diocese that had been accused of sexual misconduct with minors. Defendants identified these priests by name. Stanton was not one of the priests identified in this original list.

24. Several months later, internal church documents were leaked revealing Defendant Malone's intentional cover-up of over 60 additional priests credibly accused of sexual misconduct with minors.

25. In approximately November 2018, Defendants supplemented their original list to include 36 more priests who worked in the Diocese that had been accused of sexual misconduct with minors. Stanton was included in this list.

26. Both lists specified that "Priests who received a single allegation after their death are not included".

27. The list continues to be supplemented with additional names of credibly accused priests.

28. Defendants continue to conceal important information about the priests on that list and the names and information about accused priests not publicly disclosed. Additional

information has also not been disclosed about the credibly accused priests' patterns of grooming and sexual abuse, and the Defendants' knowledge thereof.

29. As a direct result of the Defendants' conduct described herein, Plaintiff suffered and will continue to suffer great, permanent harm, including but not limited to severe emotional distress, humiliation, embarrassment and loss of self-esteem.

30. Plaintiff has also suffered a severe disruption of his enjoyment of life, as well as his relationships with family, fellow Catholics, and others. His religious faith, together with its fellowship and other benefits, has been destroyed.

31. The trauma suffered by Plaintiff has resulted in chronic mental health issues, alcoholism, and drug abuse all of which have required and/or will require counseling and other treatment.

**CAUSES OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF
BUFFALO**

A. VICARIOUS LIABILITY/*RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR*

32. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in every one of the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

33. Plaintiff affirmatively pleads that any alleged tortious acts of Stanton were committed while he was acting in the course and scope of his employment with Defendant the Diocese, or while he were acting as an agent or on behalf of Defendant the Diocese, and are thus imputed to Defendant the Diocese under a legal theory of *respondeat superior*.

B. NEGLIGENCE

34. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in every one of the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

35. Defendant the Diocese held itself out as providing safe places for religious worship, spiritual development and growth, learning and education, or engaging in youth and/or community activities. Defendant the Diocese had, adopted, and/or assumed an express and/or implied duty to provide a reasonably safe environment for Plaintiff and assumed the duty to protect and care for him.

36. Defendant the Diocese owed a duty of care to all minor persons, including Plaintiff, who were likely to come within the influence or supervision of Diocesan clergy, including Stanton, in their roles as teacher, priest, counselor, trustee, director, officer, employee, agent, servant and/or volunteer.

37. Defendant the Diocese breached its duties of care in one or more of the following ways by and through the acts and omissions of its employees, servants and agents, including supervisory and managerial personnel, all acting at all material times within the course and scope of their employment, service or agency:

- a. Negligently hiring Stanton as it knew or should have known that he posed a threat of sexual abuse to children;
- b. Negligently retaining Stanton as it knew or should have known that he posed a threat of sexual abuse to children;
- c. Negligently directing Stanton as it knew or should have known that he posed a threat of sexual abuse to children;
- d. Negligently supervising Stanton as it knew or should have known that he posed a threat of sexual abuse to children;
- e. Failing to investigate the background of Stanton before placing him into close contact with Plaintiff;
- f. "Covering up" or otherwise failing to disclose the harmful acts of Stanton and other abusive clergy;

- g. Failing to warn Plaintiff, his parents and/or legal guardians of Stanton's conduct despite having actual or constructive knowledge of Stanton's sexually abusive tendencies and/or misconduct;
- h. Assigning or allowing Defendant Stanton to have contact with Plaintiff despite having constructive and/or actual knowledge sexual abuse;
- i. Failing to report Stanton's sexual abuse to appropriate law enforcement agencies;
- j. Minimizing, ignoring or excusing priestly misconduct over a period of decades;
- k. Negligently failing to provide a safe environment to children and other parishoners within the churches, sacristies, schools and rectories operated and/or owned by the Diocese;
- l. Failing to train priests and Diocesan employees to identify signs of child molestation by fellow employees;
- m. Failing to implement and maintain effective policies and procedures to prevent sexual abuse and abuse of children;
- n. Failing to investigate complaints of abuse properly;
- o. Failing to exercise due care under the circumstances.

38. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of Defendant the Diocese's negligence, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer the injuries described herein.

C. GROSS NEGLIGENCE

39. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in every one of the afore-numbered paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

40. Defendant the Diocese's acts and omissions, as previously described, were committed with complete and reckless disregard for, and with willful, wanton, and actual conscious indifference to, the rights, safety, and welfare of Plaintiff and the general public. The nature of Defendant the Diocese's acts and omissions were of such a nature as to constitute gross negligence and malice. Specifically, Defendant the Diocese's undertook a continuous course of action in the form of conscious decisions, with subjective knowledge and awareness of the risks

and hazards presented by each decision as discussed above and incorporated herein, to expose Plaintiff and others to sexual abuse and/or sexual assault, and exercised not even slight care or diligence. When viewed objectively from the standpoint of Defendant the Diocese at the time of their occurrence, said acts and omissions involved reckless disregard of or indifference to an extreme degree of physical, mental, and psychological risk and danger, considering the probability and the magnitude of the potential harm to others. Defendant the Diocese committed various acts and omissions constituting gross negligence, as outlined above. Such gross negligence was a foreseeable, direct, and proximate cause of the occurrence and Plaintiff's injuries and damages.

D. BREACH OF DUTY *IN LOCO PARENTIS*

41. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in every one of the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

42. While he was a minor, Plaintiff was entrusted by his parents to the control of Defendant the Diocese for the purpose of providing Plaintiff an education and spiritual development.

43. During the times that Plaintiff was in the facilities or programs owned, conducted or approved by Defendant the Diocese, he was under its control and supervision of Defendant the Diocese. Defendant the diocese owed a duty to Plaintiff to act *in loco parentis*, and to prevent foreseeable injuries.

44. Defendant the Diocese breached its duty to act *in loco parentis*. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of that breach of duty, Plaintiff suffered injuries.

E. BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

45. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in every one of the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

46. There is a fiduciary relationship between Plaintiff and Defendant the Diocese. This relationship is based on the fact that Plaintiff trusted his physical, mental, psychological, and spiritual care to the priests, officers, directors, officials, employees, volunteers, servants, and/or all those acting as agents of Defendant the Diocese or on its behalf, who held themselves out as beholden to a spiritual and interpersonal duty to provide advice, benefit, and guidance to Plaintiff.

47. Because of this fiduciary relationship, Defendant the Diocese was required and had a duty to act in the best interests of Plaintiff and to protect him while he was a minor child.

48. Defendant the Diocese breached its fiduciary duty to Plaintiff.

49. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of Defendant the Diocese's breach of fiduciary duty, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer the injuries described herein.

F. BREACH OF NON-DELEGABLE DUTY

50. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in every one of the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

51. When Plaintiff was a minor, he was placed into the care of Defendant the Diocese for the purpose of providing Plaintiff with a safe environment in which to receive an education and/or participate in religious worship, spiritual development, and community service. Because Defendant the Diocese was entrusted with the care of Plaintiff while he was a minor child, there existed a non-delegable duty of care that went from Defendant the Diocese to Plaintiff.

52. Since Plaintiff was a minor child at the time, Defendant the Diocese was in the best position to prevent the abuse that Plaintiff suffered at the hands of Stanton, and/or stop such abuse when they learned of it.

53. Defendant the Diocese failed to prevent the abuse and harm Plaintiff suffered, and/or they failed to stop it once they were aware of or should have been aware of the abuse. This failure was a breach of Defendant the Diocese's non-delegable duty to Plaintiff.

54. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of this breach, Plaintiff suffered significant injuries and long-lasting damages.

G. NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

55. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in every one of the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

56. As described above, Defendant the Diocese owed Plaintiff various duties, which it negligently breached. Defendant the Diocese's negligence unreasonably endangered Plaintiff and caused him to fear for his own safety.

57. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of Defendant the Diocese's negligence, Plaintiff suffered severe injuries, including but not limited to mental and emotional distress.

CAUSES OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF BUFFALO AND BISHOP RICHARD J. MALONE

H. FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT

58. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in every one of the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

59. For many years after Plaintiff's abuse at the hands of Stanton, Defendants engaged in a conscious, deliberate plan to conceal the abuse, including but not limited to:

- a. Concealing from the public the sexual abuse committed by Stanton;
- b. Concealing the identities of Stanton and other pedophilic priests;

- c. Concealing from appropriate law enforcement officials the sexual abuse committed by Stanton against Plaintiff and/or other minors;
 - d. Impeding or otherwise preventing Plaintiff and other victims from pursuing legal action against Stanton.
60. Defendants had a duty to disclose the information it concealed in paragraph 59, and its concealment therefore amounted to a misrepresentation.
61. Defendants concealed this information with fraudulent intent, with the goal of inducing reliance.
62. Plaintiff, and others, justifiably relied upon Defendants concealment of this material information.
63. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of Defendants' concealment, Plaintiff suffered significant injuries.

DAMAGES

64. Plaintiff seeks compensation for the following damages that resulted from his abuse and defendants' other culpable acts and omissions:
- a. Past mental anguish of Plaintiff, and that he will, in all probability, suffer in the future;
 - b. Past physical pain and suffering of Plaintiff, and that he will, in all probability, suffer in the future;
 - c. The medical expenses that Plaintiff has incurred in the past and will, in all probability continue to incur in the future;
 - d. Past and future lost wages;
 - e. Loss of earning capacity;
 - f. Cost of suit;
 - g. Such reasonable and necessary attorney's fees as are allowed by law;
 - h. Exemplary damages; and

- i. Any and all other damages to which Plaintiff may be justly entitled.

PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE

65. Plaintiff hereby requests and demand that Defendants preserve and maintain all evidence pertaining to any claim or defense related to the incident made the basis of this lawsuit, or the damages resulting therefrom, including photographs; videotapes, audiotapes; recordings; business records; medical records; billing records; estimates; invoices; checks; correspondence; memoranda; files; facsimiles; emails; voice mail; text messages; investigations; cellular telephone records; calendar entries; and any electronic image, data, or information related to Plaintiff(s), the references incident, or any damages resulting therefrom. Failure to maintain such items will constitute spoliation of the evidence.

JURY DEMAND

66. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE Plaintiff prays that Defendants be cited in terms of law to appear and answer herein, that upon final trial and hearing hereof, that Plaintiff recovers damages from Defendants in accordance with the evidence; that Plaintiff recovers costs of court herein expended; that Plaintiff recovers interest to which Plaintiff is justly entitled under law, both prejudgment and post-judgment; that Plaintiff recovers actual damages; that Plaintiff is entitled to recover compensatory damages; that Plaintiff recovers punitive damages; and for such other further relief, both general and special, both in law and in equity, to which Plaintiff may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen A. Weiss (NY ID# 2413342)
Christopher A. Seeger (NY ID# 2425304)
Rick Barreca (NY ID# 2972735)
SEEGER WEISS LLP
77 Water Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Phone: 212-584-0700
Fax: 212-584-0799
sweiss@seegerweiss.com
cseeger@seegerweiss.com
rbarreca@seegerweiss.com

Gerald J. Williams (NY ID #5620695)
Shauna L. Friedman (NY ID#5609755)
WILLIAMS CEDAR, LLC
1515 Market Street, Suite 1300
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102-1931
Phone: 215.557.0099
Fax: 215.557.0673
gwilliams@williamscedar.com
sfriedman@williamscedar.com

Application to New York Bar Pending:

Michelle Simpson Tuegel
SEEGER WEISS LLP
77 Water Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Phone: 212-584-0700
Fax: 212-584-0799
MSimpson-Tuegel@seegerweiss.com

Muhammad S. Aziz
ABRAHAM, WATKINS, NICHOLS,
SORRELS, AGOSTO & AZIZ
800 Commerce Street
Houston, Texas 77002-1776
Phone: 713-222-7211
Fax: 713-225-0827
maziz@awtxlaw.com

Pro Hac Vice Application to be Filed:

Beth G. Cole
WILLIAMS CEDAR, LLC
1515 Market Street, Suite 1300
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102-1931
Phone: 215.557.0099
Fax: 215.557.0673
bcole@williamscedar.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff